

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342
ALICE KWONG MA HAYASHI #178522
ELIANA P. KAIMOWITZ RODRIGUEZ #256712
50 Fremont Street
Post Office Box 7880
San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
Telephone: (415) 983-1000
Facsimile: (415) 983-1200
bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com
alice.hayashi@pillsburylaw.com
eliana.kaimowitz@pillsburylaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants
CAMBRIDGE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY LIMITED
and CDT OXFORD LIMITED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SUNNYSIDE DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CAMBRIDGE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY
LIMITED, CDT OXFORD LIMITED,
OPSYS LIMITED, and JOHN DOES I
through V,

Defendants.

No. C-08-1780-MHP

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT CAMBRIDGE
DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY
LIMITED'S MOTION TO STAY
CASE PENDING APPEAL**

Date: September 8, 2008
Time: 2:00 pm
Courtroom 15, 18th Floor
Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel

1 Defendant Cambridge Display Technology Limited (“CDT Ltd.”) has moved to stay
2 this action pending resolution of the appeal in *Sunnyside Dev. Co. v. Opsys Ltd.*, No. C-05-
3 553-MHP, 2007 WL 2462142 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2007), *appeal pending*, No. 07-16773
4 (9th Cir.) (“Motion”). Defendant CDT Oxford Limited (“CDT Oxford”) joins in the
5 Motion. The Motion came on for hearing on September 8, 2008, before the above-entitled
6 Court, the Honorable Marilyn Hall Patel presiding. Defendants CDT Ltd. and CDT Oxford
7 were represented by Bruce A. Ericson, Esq., and Alice K. M. Hayashi, Esq., of Pillsbury
8 Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP. Plaintiff Sunnyside Development Company LLC was
9 represented by Michael Hinckley, Esq., of Stiglich & Hinckley, LLP, and Christoph C.
10 Heisenberg, Esq., of Traiger & Hinckley LLP. The Court having read and considered the
11 Motion and the supporting and opposing papers filed by the parties, and having heard and
12 considered the arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing therefor:

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion is granted on the ground that there is
14 substantial overlap between this action and the pending appeal and a stay would serve the
15 interests of efficiency, economy and fairness to the parties. This action shall therefore be
16 stayed pending resolution of the appeal before the Ninth Circuit (No. 07-16773) or further
17 order of this Court.

18 Dated: _____
19
20

21 Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel
22 United States District Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28